<div align="center">Remarks</div>

This is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed February 1, 2007. The specification is amended to address a formality and to update reference to related applications. Claims 4, 5, 7-10, and 16 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is amended to incorporate subject matter from claims 4 and 5. Additional support for the amendments to claim 1 is found in Figure 8 of the present application. Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-15 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are requested for at least the following reasons.

I.   Objections

In section 2 of the Action, claim 16 is object under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. This objection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving this application into condition for allowance, claim 16 is canceled. Reconsideration and removal of the objection are therefore requested.

In section 3, the disclosure is objected to because of the use of the acronym "LCD." The specification is amended to provide a plain text description thereof. Reconsideration is requested.

II.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

In sections 4-6 of the Action, claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. These rejections are respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejections is not conceded. Nevertheless, in the interest of moving this application into condition for allowance, claims 7-10 are canceled. Reconsideration and removal of the rejections are therefore requested.

III.   Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

In sections 7 and 8 of the Action, claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Donnelly, U.S. Patent No. 5,892,512. This rejection is respectfully traversed, and the correctness of the rejection is not conceded. Reconsideration is requested for the following reasons.

A.   Claims 1-3 and 6

Claim 1 is directed to a commanding system for a computer. Claim 1 recites a binding table including a command binding that identifies an input sequence from an input device that is received to be acted upon, a command that identifies an intent of the input sequence, a command handler that is a pointer to a portion of code that is executed to implement the action that is to be performed based upon the input sequence, and an interface binding that identifies a menu position on a menu. Claim 1 also recites a processor programmed to receive the interface binding associated with the binding; and build a menu based on the interface binding.

Such a commanding system is advantageous, for example, because all commanding information is provided in the binding table. This information includes both the command handler that points to the portion of code that is executed to implement the action, as well as the interface binding that identifies the position on a menu to allow a menu to be dynamically generated.

Donnelly discloses a system including a construction means 6 that creates collective views such as tool bars, menu bars, and accelerator tables. Donnelly, col. 8, ll. 20-33. A base action object 200 is formed that includes all of the view attributes that are associated with a specific action. Col. 9, ll. 10-52. A menu definition object 230 is formed that includes all of the information necessary to create a standard menu bar 250 and a standard toolbar 260. Col. 11, ll. 62-66. A separate accelerator table 270 is also formed that includes a lookup table, as the action object 200 "does not handle the actual operation that is performed by a selected action." Col. 10, ll. 33-37. The accelerator table 270 is necessary because the accelerator table 270 includes all of the lookup information to generate an action when input is received from the user. Col. 13, ll. 3-20. The system disclosed by Donnelly is therefore disadvantageous because separate tables must be maintained for the action object 200 that is used to build menus / toolbars, and for the accelerator table 270 that is used to convert input to action.

Consequently, Donnelly fails to disclose a binding table including both (i) a command handler that is a pointer to a portion of code that is executed to implement the action that is to be performed based upon the input sequence, and (ii) an interface binding that identifies a menu position on a menu, as required by claim 1. In Donnelly, separate tables are used to house such information. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1, as well as claims 2, 3, and 6 that depend therefrom, are requested.

B.   Claims 11-15

Claim 11 is directed to a method for commanding a computer system, including querying a binding table, the binding table including a plurality of binding entries, at least one binding entry of the plurality of bindings entries including a command binding, a command, a handler, and an interface binding.

As noted above, Donnelly fails to disclose a table including both a handler and an interface binding, as required by claim 11. Instead, Donnelly requires separate tables to be formed to hold such information, which can be inefficient. In contrast, the method of claim 11 recites querying a binding table with a binding entry including both a handler and an interface binding. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 11, as well as claims 12-15 that depend therefrom, are requested.

IV.   Conclusion

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is requested. Please contact the undersigned attorney with any questions regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: May 1, 2007   /Robert A. Kalinsky/
                           Robert A. Kalinsky
                           Reg. No. 50,471